

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application, and for the suggestions for amending the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Specification:

The specification has been amended to correct the typographical error identified by the Examiner.

Art Rejections:

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,179,650, hereinafter *Fukui*. *Fukui* discloses a method and apparatus for editing documents. As illustrated in Figures 14 and 15, extracted data can be reorganized into a revised document. However, *Fukui* clearly does not teach or suggest extracting a *portion* of an image and processing the extracted portion in accordance with the claims of the present application. *Fukui* appears to scan or read an entire document. There does not appear to be any specific teaching in *Fukui* of extracting a portion of an entire image for processing. Furthermore, since the *Fukui* apparatus appears to scan the entire image, any reconstructed image arranged by *Fukui* is based on the entire original document, and is **not** based on the extracted document block, which is merely a portion of an entire image.

In view of the teachings of *Fukui*, claim 1 of the present application has been amended to clarify that the image processing device includes an extraction means for extracting a document block containing a specific image to be processed from among a

portion of an entire image. Furthermore, the image processing device includes, among other elements, reconstruction means for reconstructing the document block in a specific shape based on the extracted document block. Accordingly, according to the present invention set forth in claim 1, the reconstructed shape is based on the extracted document block which includes only a portion of the entire image. Accordingly, the content and size of the reconstructed block will be different than if the entire image was reconstructed.

Accordingly, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-8 are clearly patentable over *Fukui*.

Claim 9 defines a program for causing a computer to execute image processing comprising the steps of extracting a document block containing a specific image to be processed from among a portion of an entire image. Similarly, the program of claim 9 includes the step of reconstructing the document block in a specific shape based on the extracted document block. Accordingly, claim 9 and dependent claims 10-16 are also patentable over *Fukui* at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 17 defines an image processing method that includes the steps of extracting a document block containing a specific image to be processed from a portion of an entire image, recognizing character code from a character image within the document block, and reconstructing the document block in a specific shape based on the extracted document block. The method of claim 17 further includes laying out character code data corresponding to the recognized character code within the reconstructed document block. Accordingly, the method of claim 17 is also patentable over *Fukui* at least for the reasons set forth herein.

To further define the protection to which Applicants are entitled, new claims 18-27 are also submitted to further define the protection to which Applicants are entitled. The new claims are dependent claims which depend from claims 1, 9, and 17, and are thus patentable over the cited prior art at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims. New independent claim 27 is patentable at least for the reasons set forth above concerning claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: October 15, 2003

By: William C. Rowland
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620